

REMARKS

Claims 8-20 were pending in the application. Claims 8 and 20 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 8-20 remain pending and are resubmitted for consideration.

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Nguyen during the telephone conferences on February 2, 2009 and February 17, 2009 during which the claim amendments were discussed.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Seto

Claims 8-13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,036,425 (hereinafter “Seto”). The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

A. The Claims

Claims 8 and 20 are independent claims.

Amended claim 8 calls for a component placement device that comprises:

- an elongated transport device that is configured to transport a substrate in a transport direction parallel to the transport device;
- at least one component feeder that is located along a longitudinal side of the transport device;
- at least one component pick-and-place unit that is configured to: (a) pick-up a component from the at least one component feeder; and (b) place the component on the substrate; and
- at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction.

Amended claim 20 recites a component placement device that comprises:

- an elongated transport device that is configured to transport a substrate in a transport direction parallel to the transport device;

a component feeder that is located only on one longitudinal side of the transport device;
at least one component pick-and-place unit that is configured to: (a) pick-up a component from the at least one component feeder; and (b) place the component on the substrate; and
at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device.

The rejection should be withdrawn at least because Seto fails to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things: “at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction” (claim 8); and “at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device” (claim 20).

B. Seto

Seto discloses a component feeding device for a component mounting apparatus that includes a first component feeder 3, a second component feeder 4, a circuit board transfer device 6, and mounting heads 9. The second component feeder 4 includes a vertical transport device 22 and a horizontal pallet guide device 23. *See* Seto at Fig. 1. The circuit board transfer device 6 moves a circuit board in a direction of the transfer passage for circuit boards 12. The mounting heads 9 pick up components from a pick up location from the cassette-type feeders 13 of the first component feeder 3 or from the trays T of the second component feeder 4 in the pallet guide device 23. *See* Seto at Figs. 1 and 2.

The Examiner contends that the pallet guide device 23 corresponds to an elongated transport device that is configured to transfer a substrate in a direction parallel to the transport device. *See* Final Office Action at p. 2. However, pallet guide device 23 is **not** a transport

device that is configured to transport a substrate. Rather the pallet guide device 23 moves a pallet P carrying trays T of components to a pick up position. *See* Seto at col. 4, lines 54-65.

The Examiner also contends that the circuit board transfer device 6 of Seto corresponds to a substrate support, along with the X-Y stage 11. *See* Advisory Action at Continuation Sheet. However, even assuming *arguendo* that the circuit board transfer device 6 corresponds to a “substrate support” and that the transfer passage 12 corresponds to the “elongated transport device,” the circuit board transfer device 6 of Seto is not “positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located” as recited in claims 8 and 20. *See* Seto at Fig. 1. The transfer device 6 is located in the middle of the transfer passage 12.

Furthermore, the X-Y stage 11 is a movable stage for the vacuum nozzles 14 and is not a “substrate support.” *See* Seto at col. 4, lines 39-53. Thus, Seto does not teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located” as recited in claims 8 and 20. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 9-13 and 16-19 depend from claim 8 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Seto & Munezane

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,000,123 (hereinafter “Munezane”). Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Seto and Munezane, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, “at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the

longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction” as recited in claim 8.

As stated above, pallet guide device 23 is **not** a transport device that is configured to transport a substrate. Furthermore, the circuit board transfer device 6 of Seto does not have “at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located” recited in claims 8 and 20. *See* Seto at Fig. 1.

Munezane fails to cure the deficiencies of Seto. Even if, assuming *arguendo*, Munezane teaches that the distance between the guides is adjustable as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Seto and Munezane still fails to teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction” as recited in claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Conclusion


Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If

any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith,
Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment
of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 18, 2009

By 
Jessica M. Cahill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,986

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4776
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399